

1. Site Name: Hi-Mill	2. WA #: 009-RXBF-059Q	3. State: Michigan		
<b>RAC Work Assignment Performance Evaluation Form (PEF)</b>				
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Technical Performance Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Support Evaluation			
Contractor: Tetra Tech, EMI		Contract Number: 68-W7-0003		
Contractor Program Manager: Majid Chaudhry		Phone: (312) 856-8700		
Project Officer (PO): Diane Spencer		Phone: (312) 886-5867		
Contracting Officer (CO): Peggy Hendrixson		Phone: (312) 886-5864		
Contractor Site Manager: Jack Brunner		Phone: (312) 856-8788		
Work Assignment Manager (WAM): Ron Murawski		Phone: (312) 886-2940		
Performance Period - From: 12/08/97 To: 3/31/98				
<b>Contractor Performance Evaluation</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (2)	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded Expectations (3)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding (4)				
<p>Description of Activities: The work assignment is for the oversight of the ground water sampling and analysis, and oversight of related reporting by the potentially responsible party's (PRP) contractor. To date, the EPA contractor submitted a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) and an approved work plan. The EPA contractor also conducted an orientation visit of the Site, and provided written comments on the PRP contractor's annual and quarterly reports.</p>				
<p>Overall Performance Evaluation: The contractor's performance exceeded expectations. The contractor provided professional and timely written and verbal input to the work assignment manager (WAM), and exhibited in-depth, technical knowledge of appropriate subjects such as ground water sampling and analysis, ground water flow, and contaminant plume characteristics. The contractor also worked effectively with the WAM and MDEQ State Project Manager (SPM) to offer technical input and recommendations for the Site Operation and Maintenance (O&amp;M) activities.</p>				
<p>Unusual Problem/Occurrences Affecting Contractor's Performance: There were no unusual problems or occurrences affecting the contractor's performance.</p>				
Evaluator Signature: <i>Ron Murawski</i>		Date: <i>7/23/98</i>		
<b>Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet</b>				
Project Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4			
[Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); scheduling; budgeting]				

7/23/98  
64

JPS  
7/24/98

The contractor showed an ability to set implementable schedules and priorities for the work assignment. In particular, the contractor successfully prioritized work plan and HASP development activities, field orientation activities, and review activities relating to PRP contractor reports. The work plan and HASP were logically organized, and the work plan closely matched the EPA Statement of Work (SOW) format. The revised work plan required few revisions. The contractor communicated frequently and effectively with the WAM, and provided meaningful information. The contractor's work plan revealed that the contractor budgeted its efforts appropriately for the work required.

#### Technical Competence & Innovation

1	2	X	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

[Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs and procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]

The contractor showed an impressive level of technical competence in verbal and written communication with the WAM. The contractor effectively provided technical input to the WAM on the subjects of contaminant plume migration, ground water flow, and sampling and analytical techniques. The work plan, HASP, and report review deliverables were professional, thorough, and understandable. The contractor met or exceeded planned goals and objectives relating to timeliness and quality of deliverables.

#### Schedule and Cost Control

1	2	X	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

[Budget (hours & costs) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization]

The contractor maintained the planned schedule and budget in the work plan. Monthly progress reports showed an appropriate level of effort used to accomplish the work. All deliverables, including the work plan, HASP, and reviews of PRP contractor reports, were timely and high quality. The contractor was receptive to responding to the requests of the WAM. The contractor also adjusted its schedule for the field orientation visit to be synchronous with that of the PRP contractor's.

#### Reporting

1	2	X	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

[Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]

All deliverables were timely, understandable, and thorough. This included reviews of the PRP quarterly and annual reports. These reviews covered many technical issues to which the PRP contractor needed to respond. The work plan, revised work plan, HASP, and comments on the PRP contractor's O&M Report were submitted ahead of schedule (6, 13, 6, and 3 days ahead of schedule, respectively). O&M Report and Annual Report comments from the EPA contractor enabled the WAM to conduct meaningful discussions with the State and PRP contractor.

#### Resource Utilization

1	X	2	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

[Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment; Travel, etc.]

The contractor effectively used its resources to perform the work. The Site Manager only traveled to the Site to meet with EPA, the State, and the PRP contractor during the Site orientation visit. The Site Manager does not plan to visit the Site during every sampling event, only for certain activities as defined by the WAM.

#### Effort

1	2	X	3	4
---	---	---	---	---

[Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situation (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]

The contractor maintained frequent and effective communication with the WAM. When requested by the WAM, the contractor provided information quickly and meaningfully. The contractor was thorough in evaluating Site conditions and PRP contractor reports, and in presenting concerns and recommended solutions in its reviews. The contractor's monthly progress reports were very thorough, and provided the WAM with meaningful information on current and upcoming contractor and Site activities.

**From:** DIANE SPENCER  
**To:** MURAWSKI-RONALD  
**Date:** 7/23/98 3:38pm  
**Subject:** RAC eval -- Hi-Mill

Just a few notes:

Please include a row with your name and phone number as the WAM. I checked the g:user/share/contract/models/eval files and it's included in the model, so I don't know if a correction was made after you prepared your eval or what. Please include this information.

The WA# is incorrect. It should be: 009-RXBF-059Q.

Other than that, it looks okay. Just have JP initial and route it to me.

Thanks much

1. Site Name: Hi-Mill	2. WA #: 009-ROBF-059Q	3. State: Michigan		
<b>RAC Work Assignment Performance Evaluation Form (PEF)</b>				
<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Technical Performance Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/> Program Support Evaluation			
Contractor: Tetra Tech, EMI		Contract Number: 68-W7-0003		
Contractor Program Manager: Majid Chaudhry		Phone: (312) 856-8700		
Project Officer (PO): Diane Spencer		Phone: (312) 886-5867		
Contracting Officer (CO): Peggy Hendrixson		Phone: (312) 886-5864		
Contractor Site Manager: Jack Brunner		Phone: (312) 856-8788		
Performance Period - From: 12/08/97 To: 3/31/98				
<b>Contractor Performance Evaluation</b>				
<input type="checkbox"/> Unsatisfactory (1)	<input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory (2)	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> Exceeded Expectations (3)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Outstanding (4)				
<p>Description of Activities: The work assignment is for the oversight of the ground water sampling and analysis, and oversight of related reporting by the potentially responsible party's (PRP) contractor. To date, the EPA contractor submitted a Health and Safety Plan (HASP) and an approved work plan. The EPA contractor also performed field oversight of the ground water sampling activities, and provided written comments on the PRP contractor's annual and quarterly reports.</p>				
<p>Overall Performance Evaluation: The contractor's performance exceeded expectations. The contractor provided professional and timely written and verbal input to the work assignment manager (WAM), and exhibited in-depth technical knowledge of appropriate subjects such as ground water sampling and analysis, ground water flow, and contaminant plume characteristics.</p>				
<p>Unusual Problem/Occurrences Affecting Contractor's Performance: There were no unusual problems or occurrences affecting the contractor's performance.</p>				
Evaluator Signature: <i>Ron Munawski</i>		Date: 4/16/98		
<b>Evaluation Criteria Score Sheet</b>				
Project Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4			
[Organizing (e.g. work plan development, data review); scheduling; budgeting]				
<p>The contractor showed an ability to set implementable schedules and priorities for the work assignment. In particular, the contractor successfully prioritized work plan and HASP development activities, field oversight activities, and review activities relating to PRP contractor reports. The work plan and HASP were logically organized, and the work plan closely matched the EPA Statement of Work (SOW) format. The contractor communicated frequently and effectively with the WAM, and provided meaningful information. The contractor's work plan revealed that the contractor budgeted its efforts appropriately for the work required.</p>				

JPS  
4/16/98

<b>Technical Competence &amp; Innovation</b>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px;">X</td> <td style="width: 20px;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px;">4</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	X	3	4
1	2	X	3	4		
[Effectiveness of analysis; Meet plan goals; Expert testimony; Support COE/State/Enforcement; Adhere to Regs and procedures; Approach creativity/ingenuity]						
The contractor showed an impressive level of technical competence in verbal and written communication with the WAM. The contractor effectively provided technical input to the WAM on the subjects of contaminant plume migration, ground water flow, and sampling and analytical techniques. The work plan, HASP, and report review deliverables were professional, thorough, and understandable. The contractor met planned goals and objectives relating to timeliness and quality of deliverables.						
<b>Schedule and Cost Control</b>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px;">X</td> <td style="width: 20px;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px;">4</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	X	3	4
1	2	X	3	4		
[Budget (hours & costs) maintenance; Priority schedule adjustments; Cost minimization]						
The contractor maintained the planned schedule and budget in the work plan. Monthly progress reports showed an appropriate level of effort used to accomplish the work. The contractor minimized costs by having a lower graded P-level employee perform the field oversight. All deliverables, including the work plan, HASP, and reviews of PRP contractor reports, were timely and high quality. The contractor also adjusted its schedule for field oversight to be synchronous with that of the PRP contractor's.						
<b>Reporting</b>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px;">X</td> <td style="width: 20px;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px;">4</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	X	3	4
1	2	X	3	4		
[Timeliness of deliverables; Clarity; Thoroughness]						
All deliverables were timely, understandable, and thorough. This included reviews of the PRP quarterly and annual reports. These reviews covered many technical issues to which the PRP contractor needed to respond. The information provided enabled the WAM to conduct meaningful discussions with the State and PRP contractor. The contractor prepared its work plan quickly and efficiently, and the draft work plan required little revision.						
<b>Resource Utilization</b>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px;">X</td> <td style="width: 20px;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px;">4</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	X	3	4
1	2	X	3	4		
[Staffing; Subcontracting; Equipment; Travel, etc.]						
The contractor effectively used its resources to perform the work. Field oversight was delegated to a lower graded employee than the Site Manager. Travel for field oversight was more extensive at the beginning of the work assignment, to allow the employee the exposure needed to understand the field activities. The Site Manager only traveled to the Site to meet with EPA, the State, and the PRP contractor, during the Site orientation visit.						
<b>Effort</b>	<table border="1" style="margin: auto;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20px;">1</td> <td style="width: 20px;">2</td> <td style="width: 20px;">X</td> <td style="width: 20px;">3</td> <td style="width: 20px;">4</td> </tr> </table>	1	2	X	3	4
1	2	X	3	4		
[Responsiveness; Mobilization; Day-to-day; Special situation (e.g. adverse/dangerous conditions)]						
The contractor maintained frequent and effective communication with the WAM. When requested by the WAM, the contractor provided information quickly and meaningfully. The contractor was thorough in evaluating Site conditions and PRP contractor reports, and in presenting concerns and recommended solutions in its reviews. The contractor's monthly progress reports were very thorough, and provided the WAM with meaningful information on current and upcoming contractor and Site activities.						

1. Site Name: Hi-Mill, RA-O	2. WA #: 009-RXBF-059Q	3. State: MI
Contractor Performance Evaluation by Project Officer	<div>1</div>	<div>X</div> <div>2</div>
	<div>3</div>	<div>4</div>
<p>Project Officer Assessment and Certification.</p> <p>The contractor participated in a kick-off meeting/conference call on January 20, 1998. A site visit was conducted on February 4, 1998. The work plan was submitted on February 13, approximately one week ahead of schedule. A revised work plan was submitted on March 18 and approved on April 3, 1998 (approval received after this performance evaluation period). Concurrent with preparation and submittal of the work plan, the contractor was reviewing documents (Task 7). Comments on the O&amp;M plan were submitted 3 days ahead of schedule, while comments on the annual monitoring report were submitted on the due date.</p> <p>The WAM has incorrectly noted that field oversight activities were conducted during this performance period. Due to the inclusion of activities and therefore the evaluation of activities which occurred outside of the period of performance, I recommend a satisfactory rating and do not concur with the WAM's evaluation for this performance period.</p>		
Project Officer Signature: <i>Alicia M. Spencer</i>		Date: June 29, 1998

